

REMARKS

The Examiner objected to the drawings because the unlabelled boxes shown in Figures 1-11 should be provided with descriptive text labels. All boxes are labeled with reference numbers and it is unnecessary to provide descriptive text labels. The reference numerals may be found in the specification to identify each of the boxes in the figure. Since each of the boxes is labeled with the reference number, the drawings are in full compliance with all requirements.

The Examiner objected to the disclosure for not having references to figures indicia bolded within the Detailed Description of the Invention. There is no requirement that references to figures and indicia be bolded and no basis for objecting to the specification.

The Examiner objected to claims 1, 2, 4, 8, 9 and 11 for minor informalities which have been corrected by this amendment. The Examiner also objected to claims 10-11 under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, for being indefinite. The Examiner states it was unclear how a program can be executed solely within read-only memory. The claims have no restriction to execution in read-only memory and clarification as to the basis of this rejection is requested if the rejection is to be maintained.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-12 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,789,077 (Slaughter et al). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The application discloses and claims a local and remote gate making part of each component. Slaughter, however, does not disclose such an arrangement. Slaughter discloses a method for searching internet-based repositories where a client may interact with the search service. A service 112 publishes an advertisement 132 and a client 110 may use the advertisement 132 to initiate a gate 130. Gate 130 allows the client to run the services 112 by sending and receiving XML messages to and from the services 112. Slaughter discloses gated pairs where the client may construct a gate for the services 130a and a service gate 130c. As stated in Slaughter at paragraph 147, the client message gate and the service message gate pair allow messages to

be sent between the client and the services. These gate pairs do not constitute a local and remote gate but rather one gate generated on the client and another gate generated for the service.

In the rejection, the Examiner referred to column 29, lines 57-59 of Slaughter for disclosing the recited feature of "the client accessing a remote gate of the component, when the component is a remote component." However, the citation referred to by the Examiner refers to a remote gate of the client, not a remote gate of the component.

The types of gate pairs claimed in the invention and disclosed by Slaughter are different and the claims are allowable over the prior art of record. Favorable action is eagerly and earnestly solicited. If any issues remain, and the Examiner believes a telephone conversation would resolve such issues, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned attorney.

No fees are due and owing, but the Commissioner is authorized to charge Deposit Account 08-2455.

Respectfully submitted,



Christopher J. McDonald
Reg. 41,533

February 1, 2005

Hoffman, Wasson & Gitler, P.C.
Crystal Center 2
2461 South Clark Street
Suite 522
Arlington, Virginia 22202-3823
(703) 415-0100